

- Prompting an operator to input battery rating information.
- Detecting the starting of an engine based upon a measured voltage.
- Detecting starting of an engine based upon a connection to a battery.
- Providing a “cranking voltage low output”.
- Providing a “cranking voltage normal output”.
- Providing a “charged battery” output.

Independent claim 115 includes “prompting” an operator to input information related to a battery under test using an input. The cited section of Gollomp simply states, “if the data is not already present in the computer storage, it can be entered.” There is no description that there is any prompt for the information, or even how the information is entered. For example, the information could be input from another computer system, digitally transmitted to the device, entered in future devices during manufacture, etc. Further, even if a user input of this information was shown, the information could be input directly by the user. There is no description that the user is first “prompted” to enter such information. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 115 also describes detecting the starting of an engine based upon a voltage measured through electrical connections to the battery. This is not shown in Gollomp. The “Response to Argument” section simply states that it is, “implied that the user will need to start the engine for the starter test.” Even if this is correct, there is nothing that indicates that Gollomp actually detects the starting of the engine based upon a measured voltage. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further still, the pending claims state the starting of the engine is detected based upon a connection to the battery. The same portion of the “Response to Arguments” is used to support the proposition that this is found in Gollomp. However, again, Gollomp performs no detecting of starting. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, the claimed invention describes providing a “cranking voltage low output.” The “Response to Argument” section finds that Gollomp shows this somehow in their “equivalent

meaning.” However, there is no explanation how anything in Gollomp has the “equivalent meaning” of the claimed language. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, the claimed invention describes providing a “cranking voltage normal output.” The “Response to Argument” section finds that Gollomp shows this somehow in their “equivalent meaning.” However, there is no explanation how anything in Gollomp has the “equivalent meaning” of the claimed language. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, the claimed invention describes providing a “cranking voltage charge battery output.” The “Response to Argument” section finds that Gollomp shows this somehow in their “equivalent meaning.” However, there is no explanation how anything in Gollomp has the “equivalent meaning” of the claimed language. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Clearly, Gollomp, even in combination with Roberts, does not show all of the claimed elements set forth in independent claim 115. Therefore, the rejection must be withdrawn.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action’s characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:rev